



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,802	11/17/2003	Robert A. Cordery	F-650	2960

7590
Pitney Bowes Inc.
Intellectual Property & Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484

10/06/2009

EXAMINER

PRESTON, JOHN O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3691

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

***Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief***

Application No.

10/714,802

Applicant(s)

CORDERY ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN O. PRESTON

Art Unit

3691

–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments for the patentability of claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21-28 were non-persuasive. Applicant argued that Funk did not disclose, teach, or suggest sorting checks based on a sort priority number obtained from a database. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the Examiner did not rely on Funk, but rather, relied on Borgendale to suggest the limitation of obtaining a sort priority order number for the check from a database, the sort priority order number being based on a delivery location specified by the customer for an account statement associated with the account. Although Borgendale does not use the term "sort priority order number", Borgendale clearly teaches an alphanumeric string based on a delivery location specified by the customer and generated from a database (Borgendale: col 10, line 46 – col 11, line 25. In the case of Borgendale, the customer is the person sending the mail piece). In Borgendale, a digital image of the addressee's name, street name, street number, and zip code is captured (Borgendale: col 3, lines 55-65). Then, a character recognition operation is performed on the image to identify the delivery location of the mail piece (Borgendale: col 3, lines 60-67). If the operation is successful, the alphanumeric string is combined with a serial number used to identify the mail piece in an electronic mail piece folder and stored in memory (Borgendale: col 4, lines 1-20, Fig. 2). If the operation cannot successfully discern the characters in the digital image, an operator assist mode is employed, which allows an operator to view the digital image to type in the missing information with the aid of a contextual predictive keying program that accesses an addressee record database and fills in the missing information with minimal input from the operator (Borgendale: col 4, line 60 - col 5, line 30). Borgendale teaches a method of combining information obtained from a document with information obtained from a database to generate a location-specific identification for the document based on a delivery location specified by the customer. Combining the method of generating a location-specific identification in Borgendale with the sorting method taught by Funk would provide a method of sorting documents (including checks) based on their delivery location. Instead of relying solely on the document identification number disclosed in Funk (Funk: col 3, lines 60-67), the sorting method disclosed in Funk could use the location-specific identification supplied in Borgendale to

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691

/John O Preston/
Examiner, Art Unit 3691